

**General Plan 2020 Steering Committee Meeting  
July 28, 2001 – Minutes**

---

**Attendees:**

George Vanek	Alpine
Tom Weber	Borrego Springs
Richard Whitaker	Boulevard
John Elliott	Descanso
Dorothy McKenney	Jamul/Dulzura
Gene Helsel	Julian
Randy Lenac	Lake Morena/Campo
Rick Smith	Lakeside
Gordon Hammers	Potrero
Dutch Van Dierendonck	Ramona
Lois Jones	San Dieguito
John Ferguson	Spring Valley
Gil Jemmott	Twin Oaks
Jack Phillips	Valle de oro

**Visitors**

Parke Troutman	UCSD
Charlene Ayers	
Mary Allison	USDRIP
Juliana Bugbee	Lakeside
Keith Behner	Rancho Santa Fe Association
Michael Menghini	Julian
Jan Van Dierendonck	Ramona

**Planning Commissioners:**

Bryan Woods  
Dave Kreitzer

**County:**

Ivan Holler (DPLU)  
Karen Scarborough (DPLU)  
LeAnn Carmichael (DPLU)  
Tim Popejoy (DPLU)  
Neal LaMontagne (DPLU)  
Michelle Yip (DPLU)  
Tom Harron (County Counsel)  
Sachiko Kohatsu (Supervisor Slater)

Meeting commenced at 9:05 am

### **Announcement**

T. Weber brought up the issue of groundwater and the fact that it has never been reflected within the minutes. He feels that the issue of groundwater, since it is a life and death situation in Borrego, needs to be discussed. A groundwater study was passed out to the committee.

**Motion:** R. Lenac moved to include the groundwater issue in the minutes. G. Hammers seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

### **First Agenda Item: Interest Group Committee Draft Land Use Concepts and Criteria**

The Interest Group Committee has since added a concept D to the Concepts Criteria. The Concepts are being brought to this committee for discussion because of the modification made by the Interest Group Committee.

J. Phillips found the concepts to be “extremely dangerous” because it [village core, core support area] is not defined and fears that these concepts will re-define communities as 7.3 du/ac, etc. L. Carmichael replied that it was not the intent of the Interest Group Committee to force a community into a concept but rather to provide a framework for existing land uses and apply it to those that exist. K. Scarborough stated that the Interest Group Committee was responding to the Board of Supervisors and staff in giving their input from a professional planning perspective and that these concepts are to be thought of as only concepts. B. Woods added that we are not looking at the definition because it will not be part of the General Plan and the fact that it is only an idea or a concept is the reason why it is not defined. G. Hammers also shared the concerns over the lack of definition but recognized that the results would almost be identical if these were applied to two different communities, such as Potrero and Alpine as some will not apply to either of these communities and suggested moving on.

J. Ferguson thought that these concepts may serve as guidance for re-zones and asked when they would apply. B. Woods replied that if Twin Oaks were to look to have a village core, as one does not exist already, they can look at these concepts for guidance. J. Ferguson also asked if a planning group had an option to sign on or not. T. Harron responded that we are trying to draft a land use element looking at the problem of urban sprawl so that the idea is to try to identify where we have the capacity and full services for an urban core to an area that is more suburban to an area we want to protect. B. Woods added that these concepts were placed on the table to provide the committee with a planning instrument, to be seen as a model to be created and that no one had ever thought that any community belonged to any one of the concepts. L. Carmichael elaborated on this point stating that like a framework, it is very similar to our existing regional land use categories (CUDA, FUDA, etc) and does not have to be a concentric circle much like how our existing framework is not. D. Van Dierendonck also added that they should be seen as a “bag of tools” and that groups should take what they can use.

**Recommendation:** G. Hammers proposed that the word *will* in the 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet under *Rural Lands Outside Village Core* (Concept D) be changed to “shall”.

K. Scarborough commented that TDRs and PDRs are being given a considerable amount of concern due to the trepidation of downzoning without compensation. The Interest Group Committee is putting a lot of weight into TDRs so the discussion on this document should not be seen as pointless even though the concept of TDRs has not been adopted yet. R. Lenac stated that the TDR concept is looked at as a very good tool in his community.

J. Phillips expressed that he felt DPLU staff was misleading the communities and that the Board will likely apply one of these concepts to the communities. He also added that SANDAG is another aspect that the communities need to be aware of because he feels that this can be a REGIS type of control. B. Woods stated that staff was not addressing the Steering Committee with a draconian Interest Group Committee perspective. I. Holler vehemently disagreed with J. Phillips stating that staff will not be presenting to the

Board a concept to make all communities conform and has rather brought them forth to this committee for input, deletions, additions, and modifications.

G. Vanek felt that if the communities are asked to pick a concept, they will be pressured to pick one and get locked into a concept. He suggested obliterating the concepts A through D because there should not be individual concepts. R. Smith also did not like the idea of the different concepts and wants to combine them and delete the repetition.

G. Jemmott suggested adding a preamble to the document to make it more generalized since it is a variety of concepts that can be mixed and matched. Basically, it becomes a comment on behalf of the communities of their desire to be able to adjust things if they are going to take the time and effort to make it fairly exact.

**Recommendation:** T. McMaster wrote the following as a preamble to the concepts criteria: The following concepts may be used as planning tools to develop community character. Concepts may be modified as necessary to fit individual communities. The committee added: by those communities.

J. Ferguson suggested changing the term “concept” to “planning tool” or to something that will not appear like it will be imposed onto the communities. R. Lenac liked the note by the Interest Group Committee regarding TDR/PDR and would like to see the same. J. Phillips mentioned that we have not decided on TDRs and B. Woods agreed. R. Lenac stated that his community will feel better about defining maximum densities if we are to still pursue TDRs. B. Woods responded that R. Lenac should tell his community that we have hired a consultant to help us fashion the tools.

#### **Concept A –**

G. Jemmott suggested eliminating the decimal points and to round up. L. Carmichael replied that the existing land use designations use decimals and that the committee collectively agreed upon preserving as much of the existing General Plan as possible, so it basically matches the land use designations that we are working with. B. Woods added that it did not mean that a community could not decide to round up or down when embracing a concept for their community.

**Recommendation:** G. Jemmott proposed striking the 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet under *Natural Resource Areas* in areas it applies to. R. Lenac amended this proposal with the addition of generally (or as appropriate).

A suggestion was made to strike the last (5<sup>th</sup>) bullet under *Natural Resource Areas* regarding TDR/PDR. R. Lenac would rather use language that the group can embrace and rejected striking it. B. Woods added that the use of TDR/PDR are still under consideration but has not been resolved.

J. Phillips mentioned that under the *Core Support Area*, the committee has come up with duplex zoning by placing industrial next to residential. L. Carmichael responded that industrial uses go in some place in our community and we want to put industrial where they need to be placed, so the committee needs to pick where we want it and put the caveat that will make it not adjacent to residential. J. Ferguson suggested that it needs to be well buffered. G. Hammers added that it has to be close enough to walk to and off roads. J. Ferguson suggested that industrial be placed on cheap land in the corridors rather than the core. T. McMaster stated that he did not have a problem with the criteria (3<sup>rd</sup> bullet under *Core Support Area*) as it is stated in this document but when it comes down to the community plan text, that is where it will be addressed.

**Motion:** R. Smith put forth the motion of adding where compatible and well buffered in residential to the 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet under *Core Support Area*. Motion passed with two in opposition (G. Vanek and J. Phillips).

**Motion:** R. Smith put forth the motion, as it was suggested earlier, to strike the density ranges listed on the 1<sup>st</sup> bullets under *Village Core* and *Core Support Area*. G. Hammers seconded the motion. Motion passed with two in opposition (R. Lenac and J. Ferguson).

#### **Concept B –**

**Motion:** L. Jones put forth the motion to change the category title *Semi-Rural* to *Rural Residential* and within that category, to strike the 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet, change *Semi-Rural* to *Rural Residential* in the 4<sup>th</sup> bullet, and change *appropriate* to *available* and strike *may be used to support clustered projects*. J. Phillips seconded the motion. Motion passed with one abstention (T. Weber).

G. Hammers made a point of clarification in that by taking out clustering, it does not necessarily exclude the use when it is appropriate so that it is just not encouraged.

**Motion:** J. Phillips moved to remove the duplication of density ranges to keep the consistency with Concept A in the uses of density numbers and acreage for minimum lot sizes. J. Ferguson seconded the motion.

R. Smith added that the specification of densities should be eliminated and be left to the discretion of the communities.

**Amendment:** G. Jemmott suggested all changes from Concept A be carried over to Concept B. Maker of the motion (J. Phillips) agreed and stated that was his intention of the motion. Motion second (J. Ferguson) agreed. Motion passed with one in opposition (R. Lenac).

R. Lenac questioned the existence of the 7<sup>th</sup> bullet under *Village Core* due to its inconsistency. L. Carmichael clarified that Concept D came in afterwards and that particular bullet was not omitted during the creation of Concept D.

**Motion:** R. Lenac moved to remove the 7<sup>th</sup> bullet under *Village Core* under Concepts A and B. R. Smith seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

#### **Concept C –**

G. Jemmott added that Concept C should not be implemented until the main transit system is up and running.

K. Scarborough stated that the Interest Group Committee did not feel like experts on this matter and sent their suggestions to the consultants and County staff to have them hire a consultant to establish criteria in which to establish nodes. L. Carmichael added that the committee was responding to the Board by looking at transit corridors and nodes. The Interest Group Committee threw out the idea of corridors after the transit/transportation workshop (June 23, 2001) with the idea of ringing our corridors with the higher density which does not work. So this originally is responding to the Board.

G. Hammers asked where Concept C would be applicable. L. Carmichael replied that the only place that the transit line touches in the unincorporated area is in the North County Metro portion that is right next to Vista.

J. Phillips commented on the lack of definition with the term *public transit station*.

**Motion:** R. Lenac moved to withhold the concept until further definition. B. Woods suggested making the comment that Concept C is not applicable. R. Lenac was willing to withdraw his motion and apply B. Woods's suggestion.

K. Scarborough mentioned again how Concept C originally had two sections – corridor and nodes. After Alan Hoffman stated that nodes were better, the committee decided to delete corridors from the criteria.

**Motion:** G. Hammers put forth the motion to state that Concept C is not applicable to the unincorporated County at this time. J. Phillips seconded the motion.

**Amendment:** This concept will be returned to staff for revisions or definitions. Motion passed unanimously.

**Concept D –**

J. Elliott requested seeing language on groundwater dependence standards.

**Recommendation:**

B. Woods recommended having staff and T. Weber come up with a Concept E to define the desert community because they have a different set of circumstances that the rest of the County deals with and that he needs the attention to get his stuff on the table correctly.

**Motion:** G. Hammers proposed striking *existing* on the 7<sup>th</sup> bullet under *Village Core* because he feels that the word *existing* can lock in mobile homes.

**Amendment:** Apply enhance and add town atmosphere and character. Change “town” to “community” and keep *rural* to read as: Existing rural community atmosphere and character to be maintained or enhanced. Motion passed unanimously.

**Recommendation:** J. Ferguson proposed moving the 6<sup>th</sup> bullet under *Village Core* to the top of the list in order to emphasize the primacy.

**Motion:** R. Lenac proposed adding natural and recreation to the 1<sup>st</sup> bullet under Rural Lands Outside Village Core.

**Amendment:** G. Helsel recommended adding where appropriate to recreation because all areas are appropriate for the same kind of recreation but some may be appropriate for hiking, off-road or horse back riding so the goal is to retain recreational areas where appropriate. G. Hammers seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

G. Jemmott wants to add open space agriculture so that agriculture does not mean greenwaste facilities, greenhouses, or industrial type of agriculture but rather growing something out in the open. B. Woods recommended having staff look at where this needs to be addressed.

G. Hammers stated that he would like the densities to be more flexible and have the communities be able to have input into that. J. Elliott stated that he could support 40 to 160 acres if there were the addition of a Core Support Area to Concept D. B. Woods commented that if you are going to go above 40 acres, put it on slope dependent categories to protect ridgelines and the vistas that are so important to communities. G. Hammers stated that if we changed that down to 20 acres, there would not be the need for the Core Support Area in his community but if it is a lower density than 1 du/20 acres, there is a need for some kind of intermediate range. If it is resource based, why have a floor?

**Motion:** G. Hammers proposed that the maximum density be 1 du/20 ac or greater. J. Elliott seconded the motion.

**Amendment:** G. Hammers changed the 20 ac to 40 ac and proposed inserting a Core Support Area in Concept D. T. Harron stated that if the General Plan says 40, the zoning needs to be consistent with it so we do not have the flexibility to vary from what we say in the General Plan. He added that he was more comfortable with 40 ac. Motion passed.

**Correction:** It is to be the addition of a Rural Residential category (formerly *Semi-Rural*) to Concept D and not a Core Support Area. Maker of the motion (G. Hammers) agreed. Motion

second (J. Elliott) has a concern over the 5<sup>th</sup> bullet under "Rural Residential" (formerly *Semi-Rural*). He does not want any mention of sewers in Concept D.

**Amendment:** Strike the 5<sup>th</sup> bullet under "Rural Residential" (formerly *Semi-Rural*). Motion passed unanimously.

**Motion:** G. Jemmott proposed to strike the 4<sup>th</sup> bullet under "Rural Residential" (formerly *Semi-Rural*). If an area has already been divided up but not predominantly built-out, there may be people who may want to live in these areas and should not be limited to currently existing areas. G. Helsel thinks that it is very applicable to Julian because there are very well defined population density areas and their goal is to not create new population density areas. B. Woods agreed that this particular criteria is helpful and the motion was removed from the table.

**Motion:** J. Phillips moved to have the same statement under A and B, that it is still under consideration but not resolved. Motion passed unanimously.

G. Helsel commented that we endorsed the population in the unincorporated area of the County of 660,000 and what we need to address is this TDR issue and how it will affect our population target. Feels that if we are going to endorse this TDR/PDR concept, then we need to hold firm our population target. Need to state that TDRs are fine as long as they do not exceed the 660,000 number. Committee agreed that this will not be discussed at this time and will be the topic at the next meeting.

**Motion:** T. Weber moved to direct staff to develop a concept for the Borrego Springs/Desert area and bring it back to the Steering Committee for their consideration. J. Phillips did not feel this should be a motion since the committee should not be voting on specific planning area recommendations. Motion was removed from the table.

**Recommendation:** T. Weber recommended that staff schedule a presentation on groundwater supply. B. Woods supported this recommendation and recommended that staff bring John Peterson, Groundwater Geologist (DPLU), come in to speak.

### Next Meeting

The next Steering Committee meeting is scheduled for August 25, 2001.

**Motion:** R. Smith moved to support six conceptual planning tools as follows: Town Center west of CWA, Town Center Support Area, Rural Residential, Natural Resource Area, Transit Nodes (only because everyone is trying to keep it), and Town Center east of the CWA. *Rural Lands Outside Village Core* has to be merged with the Natural Resource Area. most of it is redundant with the exception of the 1<sup>st</sup> bullet. Due to the lack of time for discussion, B. Woods suggested this motion be placed on the agenda for the next meeting.

### Public Comment

E. Bowlby (Sierra Club) requested that comments be taken from the public before the committee voted on a motion.

Meeting concluded at 12:05 pm